UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,411	02/01/2001	Jared J. Jackson	ARC920000141US1	8007

23334 7590 04/22/2004

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI
& BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER	
GODDARD, BRIAN D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	4

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/775,411	JACKSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian Goddard	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 June 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0191737 to Steele et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,467 to Dillon.

Referring to claim 1, Steele discloses the method as claimed. See Figures 9-13 and the corresponding portions of Steele's specification for this disclosure. Steele teaches a method comprising the steps of:

receiving data from a web site [See Paragraph 0139 & Steps 1204-1208] located across a network [See Figs. 2 & 9-10];

determining whether additional data [dynamic pages] from the web site is extractable [See Paragraph 0139];

in response to determining that additional data from the web site is extractable, creating at least one synthetic hyperlink [reconstructed URL] for extracting the data from the web site [See Paragraph 0148]; and

combining the at least one synthetic hyperlink with the data received from the website to create combined data [forward index URLs (See Paragraph 0148)].

Steele does not explicitly send the combined data to a crawler as claimed. However, Steele does state that while conventional crawler/spider indexing methods cannot crawl dynamic links, this is corrected by his invention. See Paragraph 0127 for the details of this disclosure. This provides suggestion for sending the reconstructed URLs for dynamic pages to a crawler in order for the crawler to crawl dynamic pages. Furthermore, although not explicitly stated, Steele's method operates in the manner of a crawler altogether, thus adding further suggestion for passing the reconstructed URLs as claimed.

Dillon discloses a system and method similar to that of Steele, wherein the URL(s) of dynamic pages loaded by a browser are passed to a crawler that is itself incapable of constructing the URL to crawl it. See Figure 4 and the corresponding portion of Dillon's specification for this disclosure. Dillon discloses the purpose for this

practice as allowing the crawler to obtain the content from the dynamic page so as to crawl and index further should this content contain any other URLs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Dillon's teaching of passing URLs for dynamic pages to a crawler to the system and method of Steele, such that Steele's server (206) passed the combined URL data to a crawler to obtain the invention as claimed. One would have been motivated to do so because of the suggestions provided by both Steele and Dillon, as discussed above.

Referring to claim 2, the method of Steele in view of Dillon as applied to claim 1 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12-13 and the corresponding portions of Steele's specification for this disclosure. Steele v. Dillon teaches the method of claim 1, as above, wherein the step of creating at least one synthetic hyperlink [See above] comprises the step of augmenting a hyperlink request [See Paragraph 0148] with at least one parameter value [input tuple] appropriate for a form used by the web site [See Paragraphs 0126-0130 & 0148] to create at least one synthetic hyperlink [reconstructed URL] as claimed.

Referring to claim 3, the method of Steele in view of Dillon as applied to claim 1 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 9-13 and the corresponding portions of Steele's specification for this disclosure. Steele v. Dillon teaches the method of claim 1, as above, wherein the step of creating at least one synthetic hyperlink comprises the step of augmenting a hyperlink request [See claim 2 above] with at least

one parameter value determined by executing a script [See Paragraphs 0130 & 0139] contained in the data from the web site...[See claim 2 above] as claimed.

Referring to claim 4, the method of Steele in view of Dillon as applied to claim 1 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 9-13 and the corresponding portions of Steele's specification for this disclosure. Steele v. Dillon teaches the method of claim 1, as above, wherein the step of creating at least one synthetic hyperlink comprises the step of augmenting a hyperlink request [See claim 2 above] with at least one parameter value determined by a script filter analyzing a script [See Paragraphs 0130 & 0139, and Paragraphs 0190-0196] contained in the data from the web site...[See claim 2 above] as claimed.

Referring to claim 5, the method of Steele in view of Dillon as applied to claim 1 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 9-13 and the corresponding portions of Steele's specification for this disclosure. Steele v. Dillon teaches the method of claim 1, as above, wherein the step of creating at least one synthetic hyperlink comprises the step of augmenting a hyperlink request [See claim 2 above]...the synthetic hyperlink indicating that it must be converted to a different method [See Paragraphs 0148, 0190-0196 & 0279] for extracting data from the web site as claimed.

Referring to claim 6, the method of Steele in view of Dillon as applied to claim 1 above discloses the invention as claimed. See the discussions regarding claims 1 & 5 above for the details of this disclosure. Steele v. Dillon teaches a method comprising the steps of:

receiving a synthetic hyperlink request [at the crawler (See claim 1 above)];

converting the synthetic hyperlink request to a method indicated by the synthetic hyperlink request...[See claim 5 above]; and

sending the converted hyperlink request to a web site [the crawler uses the reconstructed & converted URL to access the dynamic page for crawling (See the combination above, as well as the relevant cited portions of Steele & Dilley)] as claimed.

Referring to claim 7, the method of Steele in view of Dillon as applied to claim 6 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Paragraphs 0148 & 0279 of Steele's specification, in light of the combination above, for this disclosure. Steele v. Dillon teaches the method of claim 6, as above, wherein the converting step includes converting the synthetic hyperlink from a GET method to a POST method as appropriate.

Claims 8-12 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-5 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 1-5 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 13-14 are rejected on the same basis as claims 6-7 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 6-7 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 15-18 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-4 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 1-4 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 19-20 are rejected on the same basis as claims 6-7 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 6-7 above for the details of this disclosure.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,601,020 to Myers and U.S. Patent No. 6,377,984 to Najork et al. are each considered particularly pertinent to applicants claimed invention.

The remaining prior art of record is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure, and/or portions of applicants claimed invention.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Goddard whose telephone number is 703-305-7821. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

bdg
16 April 2004